DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 167 CS 211 040

AUTHOR Plattor, Emma
TITLE Collaborative Action Research in Listening: Staff Development and the Teaching of Oral Language.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Oracy Convention (Norwich, England, April 1, 1987).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Research; *Cognitive Processes; *Cooperative Planning; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Instructional Development; *Listening Comprehension; Listening Skills; Models; Student Role; Teacher Role; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Calgary Inquiry Listening Project; Canada

ABSTRACT

Although the teaching of listening has been mandated in Alberta, Canada for nearly ten years, little assistance has been available to help teachers develop effective instructional strategies for teaching the subject. This paper describes the Calgary Listening Inquiry Project (CLIP), a collaborative action research project currently functioning in Calgary, Alberta, which is designed to provide teachers with an opportunity to expand their knowledge in the field of oracy and to improve their practice in the teaching of listening. The paper first presents an overview of listening and listening instruction both past and present, noting that although there remains a dearth of material of this nature at the present time, it is clear that strategies and activities can be designed to teach listening skills. Action research as a staff development model is discussed next, and the Calgary Listening Project is then described, including its objectives, development, and implementation. Finally, the role of students as active collaborators in the project is exemplified in an excerpt of student comments about themselves and others as listeners, revealing their understanding of the relationship which exists among listening ability, personal satisfaction, and skill development in school. A listening profile is appended, and references are attached. (NH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290167

COLLABORATIVE ACTION RESEARCH IN LISTENING:

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND THE TEACHING OF ORAL LANGUAGE

Emma Plattor

Faculty of Education

University of Calgary

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emma Plattor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

April 1, 1987

International Oracy Convention

Norwich, England

CS211010

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

John and Joanne are both 12 years old. When asked how they feel about listening, John's reply is positive and emphatic. "I think listening is important because if you didn't listen you wouldn't know what to do. If you couldn't listen your life wouldn't be interesting."

Joanne agrees. Her response, however, is more thoughtful and personal. "I think when you're up front doing your oral report it feels good to have someone interested in your subject. It makes you have confidence in doing something you know so you'll go through your report more easily. If you have their (the listeners') concentration it's like they're helping you through. But you can't expect them to give you their full attention if you don't give them your full attention. If you find it a hard trouble to listen, you have to force yourself to listen. Then people will look up to you."

These perceptive comments reveal the students' understanding of the relationship between listening ability, personal satisfaction and skill development in school. The students are members of the Calgary Listening Inquiry Project (CLIP), a collaborative action research project currently ongoing in Calgary, Alberta, Canada which is designed to provide teachers with an opportunity to expand their knowledge in the field of oracy and to improve their practice in the teaching of listening. Actively involved as collaborators, the students' comments and concerns are providing data essential to this quest.

In this paper, an overview is presented of listening and listening instruction both past and present. Action research as a staff development model is discussed and the Calgary Listening Project is described, including its objectives, development, and implementation. Finally, the role of students as active collaborators in the project is exemplified in an excerpt of their comments about themselves and others as listeners.

Listening and Listening Instruction

Listening is the first language mode that children acquire. It provides a foundation for all aspects of language and cognitive development and it plays a lifelong role in the processes of learning and communication essential to productive participation in daily life.

While the definition of listening is still evolving, there appears to be agreement in the literature that listening is indeed a distinct behavior that can be taught. (See Hanley, 1956; Spearritt, 1962; and Pearson and Fielding, 1982.) A number of writers suggest that instruction be based on listening purposes, and provide strategies and processes for accomplishing this. For example, Devine (1982) cites three: accurate, purposive, and critical listening. His teaching suggestions for upper elementary and secondary students range from developing consciousness-raising devices to focussing students on the listening act to recognizing and dealing with emotive language and bias.

Wolff et al. (1983) suggest four purposes for listening: discriminative, evaluative, appreciative, and empathetic. They specify three processes based on these which adults can use to enhance listening comprehension: emotional, physical, and mental self-preparation; detecting organizing patterns in aural messages; and selecting and using expedient note-taking systems while listening.

Wolvin and Coakley (1985) provide five such purposes: discriminative, comprehensive, therapeutic, critical, and appreciative. They outline a number of activities at the adult level for improving listening skills in order to meet these purposes. Hoskisson and Tompkins (1987) present a series of strategies for listening instruction at the elementary school level based on three of Wolvin and Coakley's purposes. For comprehensive listening, they suggest these strategies: creating imagery, categorizing, asking questions, organizing, note-taking, and attention directing. For critical listening, they cite strategies involving persuasive language and propaganda devices. For appreciative listening, they describe strategies based on skills identified by Wolvin and Coakley, including the ability to visualize, to recognize mood and tone, to interpret character from dialogue, and to understand the effect of the audience on a speaker's responses.

While there remains a dearth of material of this nature at the present time, it is clear that strategies and activities can indeed be designed to enhance the teaching of listening at a variety of instructional levels. Nevertheless, despite the many testimonials to the importance of listening that appear in the literature, writers in the field consistently speak of a lack of emphasis on listening instruction in schools. Many reasons are provided; the most pervasive appears to be that teachers themselves have not received listening instruction and are therefore at a loss as to how to teach listening. Wolvin and Coakley (1985) put it this way:

> As we reflect upon our early school days, how many of us can recall any structured listening training?. . . Too frequently the only "instruction" in listening that we received was requests and commands to pay attention and/or a few lists of listening dos and don'ts. As we reflect upon our later school days (from junior high through higher

education), we recall that we continued to receive little or no training in developing our proficiency in listening, the skill we use most frequently. (p. 17)

Burley-Allen (1982) reinforces this lack of training notion. In fact, she says, our formal training in communication is backwards. She provides a chart which reveals how bad the situation really is (p. 31).

Mode of Communication	Formal Years of Training	Percentage of Time Used
Writing	12 years	9%
Reading	6-8 years	16%
Speaking	1-2 years	35%
Listening	0-½ years	40%

It is interesting to note that these time-use figures have been consistent in the literature since Rankin's classic 1926 study, which revealed that schools' instructional emphasis on reading and writing was 52% and 30% respectively, while their emphasis on speaking and listening was 10% and 8% respectively. For years it would seem that we have given the most instructional attention to what we do the least.

In a recent paper on teachers as listeners, Swanson (1986) points out that teachers not only have had little instruction in listening throughout their own school careers but also have had little instruction in listening at the preservice professional education level.

> Most teachers are not trained in listening. They tend to be operating from the "flat earth" perspective of the 3Rs, believing that listening develops "naturally." Unfortunately that natural development assumption is true for very few. (p. 10)

Swanson describes a survey he conducted of 15 textbooks in use in the few teacher education programs that offer courses in communication skills training. Few, he reports, provide any information about listening.

> Out of a total of 3,704 pages of text in all of these fifteen textbooks, only 82 pages mention listening. Three prescriptive lists about teachers and listening are even focused on the teacher as speaker/sender. Only two out of 36 items on these lists focus on the teacher as listener. (p. 13)

These pessimistic findings reflect reality in the classrooms of Alberta, Canada as well as elsewhere in North America. Between 1978 and 1982 the Department of Education in this province published three new language arts curriculum guides, one each at the elementary, junior, and senior high school levels. Each contains statements emphasizing the importance of teaching listening as a language arts strand as well as across the curriculum. Each mandates the teaching of listening.

However, not one guide provides more than five pages of content on the teaching of listening, nor anything more than minimal guidelines suggesting how listening should be taught. Nor have these guides been supplemented in later years with publications concerned specifically with listening instruction, as has been the case with the other language arts strands.

If the teaching of listening is important, if it is mandated, and if little instruction in the teaching of listening is provided at the preservice level, it is reasonable to assume that listening is a strong component of staff development programs. Unfortunately it is not. Most teachers tell us that they have never taken an inservice course in listening, nor have many been offered to them.

The literature also reveals that, when teachers do attempt to provide listening instruction, it is usually on the basis of what they know--the teaching of reading. Thus such skills as determining the main idea, following details in sequence, noting supporting details, distinguishing fact from opinion, and summarizing a speaker's main points are emphasized, often to the exclusion of skills concerning the comprehension of spontaneous and planned spontaneous language. Students need to know how to focus attention, deal with nonverbal and vocal clues, cope with oral directions, listen with empathy, predict, paraphrase, expand on a speaker's ideas, raise appropriate questions, and the like.

It is interesting to note that, when asked how they know their teachers and friends are listening, the most common response given by students is, "She/he looks me right in the eye." Reading nonverbal language, coping with the fillers of expressive language, and using language to reflect and learn should be accepted features of the listening program. At this point, in most existing programs, they are not.

Often when answers are unknown or unclear it is because the right questions have not been asked. This appears to be the case in listening instruction. In 1977, Shuman published a book, Questions Teachers Ask, which provided some of the answers of over 3,000 teachers to a letter requesting that they send to him questions which perplexed them. Shuman attempted to balance the sections of his book in a proportion roughly reflecting the categories in which the teachers posed their 946 questions. Oracy, clearly, was not a predominant problem, as Shuman points out in his Preface.

> I would have hoped to have major sections on subjects such as drama, speaking, listening, and articulation among secondary schools, colleges, and universities. However, because only eleven questions

had to do with speaking and listening, I had to conclude that these topics were not foremost in teachers' minds. (Preface, unpaged)

The findings of a study by Dunne (1982) in Alberta reinforce this concern. Its major purpose was to investigate teachers' perceptions concerning the frequency with which junior high school language arts teachers implemented the concepts and skills prescribed in Alberta's junior high school language arts curriculum guide. He found that concepts and skills relating to reading and literature were perceived as the most frequently implemented, while those relating to oral language were rarely seen as receiving attention.

Dunne also asked the teachers in his study for factors which they perceived facilitated or inhibited the implementation of these concepts and skills. Among those that teachers felt facilitated instruction were: they had learned the concepts and skills at school; they were knowledgeable in the area; the concepts and skills were easily taught and tested; they know how to teach them, and many texts and other support materials were available in the area.

The factors which the teachers perceived as inhibiting implementation were the reverse of those seen as facilitators: the concepts and skills were new to them; they did not understand either the concepts and skills or the pedagogy; they were not knowledgeable in the area; and the content was considered by administrators and parents as a frill and extra to the curriculum.

Clearly, content that teachers see as new and different, difficult to understand and teach, and of little value or utility is not open to easy or frequent implementation. On the other hand, if assistance is provided with the teaching of this content, and if its value is demonstrated, teachers are more likely to attempt to provide appropriate instruction even where the content is new to them.

Listening is just such content for teachers at all grade levels. The mandate to include instruction in listening within the school curriculum speaks to its value as a school subject. The provision of staff development programs in listening speaks to a willingness on the part of school administrators and teacher trainers to support the enhancement of instruction in oracy.

The Calgary Listening Inquiry Project

As noted earlier, the teaching of listening has been mandated in Alberta for close to 10 years. However, little assistance has been available to teachers in terms of developing effective instructional strategies, building curriculum, or determining appropriate assessment techniques in this area. The Calgary Listening Inquiry Project (CLIP) is an effort to deal with this problem.

The project's setting is a large urban school district in Calgary, Alberta. There is a history of sharing and collaboration between personnel in this district and the faculty of the University of Calgary, especially in the language arts. Staff developers from both institutions are equally responsive to teacher needs. As a result, teachers are very responsive to staff development programs delivered by both institutions either individually or jointly. Thus the climate was highly conducive to the launching of this project.

CLIP is an outgrowth of a pilot project in listening undertaken during the years 1982-84 in one junior high school in the Calgary Board of Education. This pilot was based on a need expressed by the staff of this school for more information on how their students learned, how well they listened, and how instructional sequences might be developed most effectively to expand students' listening abilities.

In an effort to answer their questions about listening, teachers contacted the board's secondary language arts specialist, who in turn contacted me. Together we formed an action research team which was later joined by other school-based personnel. The school's administrative team was highly supportive throughout and we learned a great deal together.

As word spread about the pilot project, other members of the Board's language arts team began to receive requests from teachers for information about its activities and findings. Workshops on listening were also requested. The provision of these, as well as continued dissemination of information from the pilot project, whetted the appetites of a number of other school staffs, who requested involvement in a similar project. By the beginning of 1985 CLIP was born, with a steering committee, a university facilitator, and a set of interested elementary and junior high schools.

CLIP is based on a staff development model which dates back to the 1940's, that of collaborative action research. Lewin (1948) termed the model "action research"; his definition of this model implied the application of research tools and methods to immediate practical problems, with the goal of contributing to theory and knowledge in the field of education and improving practice in schools. Collaborative action research as defined in the 1970's and 1980's suggests that each group represented in the action research project shares in the planning, implementation, and analysis of the research, and that each contributes different expertise and a unique perspective to the process (Smulyan, 1980).

The terms action research, teacher research, classroom research, and collaborative action research are often used interchangeably today. Hopkins (1985) defines this model as "an act undertaken by teachers either to improve their own or a colleague's teaching or to test the assumptions of educational

theory in practice" (p. 1). Tikunoff, Ward, and Griffin (1979) describe it as one in which "teachers and researchers work with parity and assume equal opportunity to identify, inquire into, and resolve the problems of classroom teachers. . . . It assumes a work with rather that a work on posture" (p. 5). Cosgrove (1981) describes a number of conditions and circumstances essential to the success of action research projects. All of these are appropriate to CLIP.

1. Teachers are willing to examine their practice critically.
2. Teachers are willing to communicate their findings to other people--to make public what happens in their classrooms and why it happens that way.
3. Teachers are willing to involve the students in the action research process.
4. People are available to give moral support during the process.

The project's participants are self-selected teachers in three elementary and two junior high schools. Its overall objectives, as designated by the collaborative action research team, are:

1. to undertake a series of school-based studies in the area of listening derived from practitioner defined problems and concerns;
2. to develop, implement, and evaluate effective strategies, materials, and activities for listening instruction;
3. to build a cadre of teachers who can function as resource and support personnel for other teachers in listening instruction.

Two of these objectives have already been met. School-based studies have been designed and carried out by teachers and a cadre has been built of classroom-based personnel who have begun to communicate their findings to other teachers. Initial steps have been taken to meet the third objective--that of

building listening curriculum. It is interesting to note that participating teachers did not feel comfortable about doing this until they had completed their investigation of both the literature in the field and their specified research questions.

A number of teacher objectives were also generated by participants to guide their study. These included:

1. to identify concerns and problems about the teaching of listening;
2. to develop a knowledge base concerning the field of oral communication, with specific emphasis on listening;
3. to determine those features of oral language that relate to proficiency in listening and to achievement in other school subjects;
4. to develop a knowledge base concerning listening assessment, and select and administer evaluation instruments appropriate to both listening instruction and the research questions;
5. to participate in the establishment of a data base of student information for use in the project;
6. to develop teaching strategies, materials, and activities for teaching listening;
7. to provide feedback and support to other members of the project;
8. to share, on an on-going basis, development and implementational events and outcomes.

Each of these objectives has been met, in varying degrees, by the CLIP participants. Success in this regard has depended on the focus of the individual participant's inquiry questions as well as his/her personal needs and concerns in the listening and staff development areas.

Two standardized listening tests were administered at the start of the project in order to provide participants not only with baseline data about students' listening skills but also with a common vocabulary about listening. As teachers examined and administered these instruments, they came to understand how the test developers perceived the characteristics of oral language in general and listening in particular. As well, the data obtained from the administration of these tests helped teachers to define their inquiry questions.

These instruments had been used in the pilot project and were considered appropriate to CLIP's student population. They were the Listening Comprehension Tests (Wilkinson et al., 1980), developed in England and Canadianized by the Edmonton (Alberta) Public School Board, and the Alberta Listening Tests developed in Alberta (Plattor et al., 1978). The Listening Comprehension Tests contain a number of subtests designed to measure five elements of listening comprehension: content, prediction, phonology, register, and relationship. The Alberta Listening Tests contain six domain structures: voice production factors; linguistic factors--words and sentences; and organizational factors--literal comprehension, interpretive comprehension, and critical comprehension. The subtests represent a variety of formats (prose, poetry, dialogue, reports, etc.) and language styles (spontaneous, planned spontaneous, and written language read aloud), and are based on objectives specified by a steering committee representative of Alberta teachers at a variety of grade levels.

As the project continued and new questions arose, additional instruments were sought, examined, selected, and administered. For example, in an effort to study the relationship of students' listening skills to their abilities in speaking, reading, and writing, the Test of Adolescent Language (Hammill et al., 1980) was administered to a selection of junior high school students. This

instrument contains subtests in each of these areas and a technique for determining relationships among them. An interest in the creative aspects of listening led to the administration to students at both the elementary and junior high school levels of the "Sounds and Images" subtest of Thinking Creatively with Sounds and Words (Torrance et al, 1973). This test asks students to respond three times to a set of four sounds, stretching their imaginations with each new response. Students were also requested to draw their responses to the sound sets as well as to write about them in a variety of formats.

A major research question at all grade levels was this: Can we develop a Listening Profile through direct observation of students engaged in communication activities? The answer was positive; the Profile is now complete and is in use by project teachers as well as others in the school system. A copy of the Profile is appended at the end of this paper. As well, teachers developed a Listening Awareness Assessment Questionnaire which they administered to students at several grade levels in an effort to heighten students' interest in listening as well as to gain information about their understanding of the listening process and the development of skill in listening. Students were asked whether they believed they were good listeners; how they know when people were or were not listening to them; what they did when people were not listening to them; what aided or prevented their listening well; and what had happened during their own school experience that helped or hindered their becoming good listeners.

During the two year duration of CLIP, many inquiry projects have been developed in order to answer questions posed by the participants. Space precludes an extensive listing; only a sample is provided here.

Among the questions generated by the elementary teachers were: (1) Is there a relationship between listening skills and students' levels of talk? (2) Is there a correlation between students' listening skills and their backgrounds and interests? (3) How aware are students of the effectiveness of their own and other people's listening skills?

Junior high school teachers, as noted earlier, were interested in determining relationships between listening and the other language arts strands. As well, they undertook a comparison of the listening skills of students in various socio-economic environments throughout the city. Recently, they began a study to examine the listening skills of students currently enrolled in English unilingual, French bilingual, and late immersion French classes in a specific school.

As interest grew in the project, new groups of teachers requested inclusion in the collaborative action team. In some instances, these were teachers within the established CLIP schools. In other cases, teachers in other schools requested inclusion. To the extent that personnel were available to assist these teachers, requests were granted.

A major objective of the project is the building of a cadre of teachers who can function not only as support staff in the area of listening but also as disseminators of information about listening and the work of CLIP. As ownership in the project grew, more teachers volunteered for this task. Project participants have conducted workshops within their own schools as well as in other city and provincial schools and jurisdictions.

Data obtained to answer participants' questions are still in the analysis stage. However, it would appear from a preliminary examination of these data that the following cautious comments are in order: (1) Student listening skills vary in terms of socio-economic area as well as general language skill

development; (2) Students have more success in listening with the element of prediction than they do with the elements of general comprehension and phonology; (3) Students comprehend aspects of written language read aloud with less difficulty than they comprehend aspects of spontaneous language; (4) Students' listening ability is consistent with their ability in the other language arts strands (reading, writing, and speaking); and (5) Students listening skills can be effectively assessed through observation.

Students as Collaborators

This paper would not be complete without a brief reference to the role and function of students as collaborators in an action research project. From CLIP's inception, students were involved not as passive subjects in the data collection process but as active participants whose opinions and ideas were respected in a mutual quest for knowledge.

Again, space precludes a prolonged discussion of examples of this collaboration. However, the following comments abstracted from the script of a two-hour discussion with a group of grade six (11-12 year old) students will serve as an example of the extent to which students are willing to think critically on a sustained basis once they have taken ownership in solving a problem.

One of our research questions involved determining how well students were aware of effective listening habits and skills and could articulate indicators of these. As part of this two-hour discussion, we asked the students to consider who was their best listener, and why.

Student 1: My best listener is my best friend. I know he's listening to me because we have the same problems and we listen to each other's problems.

Teacher: What do you do when you listen?

Student 1: You concentrate on what he knows and you give him suggestions about how he can solve his problems. It's like you're being brothers. If you've got a younger brother, he comes up to you and says, "Big brother, what do I do? This bully's pushing me around."

Teacher: So you respond and ask questions.

Student 1: Right. You listen.

Student 2: I think my best listener is myself. I'm always thinking in my head what I should do about things. I listen to myself.

Student 3: All of my best friends listen to me most of the time. They look at me so I know they're listening. But I also think enemies listen to you. They're looking for your weak spots, and if you say something wrong they say, "No, no, that's not right. It's this." And they're waiting for a moment when you say something wrong.

Teacher: Do you think a person is a good listener when he or she interrupts?

Student 3: Well, they've been listening, but they haven't listened for their learning skills!

Student 4: I also think it's your best friend because you can trust them and they probably know you a bit better than some other people. You can tell when they're listening to you because they're looking at you and they look interested. What you said about interrupting . . . if they interrupt you to say, "Well maybe you could do this," that's good. But if they interrupt you to say, "What?" you know you're kind of losing them.

Teacher: So it's not the fact that they interrupt but how they interrupt.

Student 4: Yes. If they say "Pardon me," you <u>know</u> you're losing them.

Student 5: Well, I know that people are paying attention to you when you say something incorrect and they'll correct you. Like if I said, "My bowling ball is 20 feet by 20 feet," then they would say, "No, that's incorrect." Then you'd know they were paying attention. Sometimes when I'm watching television my father says something like, "You've got to wash the car 10 times." And then I say, "OK." Then after I finish washing the car once my father says, "You've got nine more times to go." And I say, "Why?" And he says, "Well, when you were watching TV I said you had to wash the car 10 times." And that's how you can tell if someone's not paying attention.

Student 6: Beside my best friends, I think the best listeners are strangers, because if you just made friends with them they'd want to get to know you so they'd listen to what you have to say. They'd want to find out what you're like.

Teacher: What would they do?

Student 6: Well, they look at you and say, "Yeah, me too." And they add to the conversation. They don't just sit there going, "Uh huh."

Student 7: I think my best friend is my dog. She sometimes stares at me or sort of looks really funny at me. Like she understands. Sometimes I even talk to myself. People think I'm mad.

Student 8: My best listener is Leanne here. We listen to each other pretty well because when I'm talking to her she always looks me straight in the eyes, and when I'm listening to her I look her straight in the eyes. And if she's sad I'll touch her arm or her hand or something. . . and I also add to the conversation and try to keep her company.

Student 9: It's usually Kim, my friend, who listens to me best. But other than that it's probably my brothers. We fight a lot, usually over who has to clean the basement or something. And I know they're listening because when I say something bad they'll respond and say something even worse. Then I'll say something worse, and they'll get so mad they'll try to hit me.

Teacher: So it doesn't have to be a positive response that indicates someone is listening. It can be negative too. That's an interesting point.

Student 10: Well, sometimes I talk to my dog. You can tell when she's listening to you because when she wants to be scratched she scratches you. When she's listening she stops doing that and kind of cocks her head, and then she leans forward and licks you. And sometimes animals listen with their eyes, because they can't really talk. And sometimes you listen to them with your eyes.

Burley-Allen (1982) provides the following definition of effective listening:

> Listening is (a) taking information from speakers, other people or ourselves while remaining nonjudgemental and empathetic; (b) acknowledging the speakers in a way that invites the communication to continue; and (c) providing limited but encouraging input to the talker's response, carrying the person's idea one step forward. (p. 3)

How interesting to discover all of these aspects of listening in the students' comments about their best listeners. Whether adult, peer, or pet, it is clear that students are aware of and can articulate the indicators of effective listening.

Do students feel that their time is well spent as active collaborators in action research? To find out, we asked them what they felt they had learned from this discussion about listening.

Student 1: I learned how animals communicate. I think it's important to know what they know so you can communicate with them better.

Student 2: Mostly I learned that it's important to listen. Some people might say, "Oh, it's not important to listen." But it really does some good because it doesn't feel good when you're talking to someone and they don't respond or anything. It's just like talking to a wall.

Student 3: I learned that not everything is boring. I think this is probably the best day I've had so far. It's so much fun talking and having other people listen. I thought it would be boring.

Student 4: It feels good just to tell people openly how you feel about things that are all cooped up inside you. That's what I learned. You can just hear what other people say and so you could do something to improve it a bit.

Student 5: Sometimes I find it really hard to share some things. Because I get shy and I get really embarrassed when I share things. But today I learned how to do that better.

Student 6: The most important thing I learned is this. At the beginning of the morning I didn't know about other people's opinions on what their expectations were towards listening. Like Sabina, she told me what she appreciates, and how she likes to be listened to. So if she wants me to listen to her, I won't fidget anymore. I know now how people want me to react towards them.

Time well spent? Indeed!

In Conclusion

We have learned a good deal about ourselves, our students, and the listening process through our participation in the Calgary Listening Inquiry Project. Team-based inquiry in classrooms is clearly a workable model for staff development since it involves all members of a collaborative research team in a search for answers to questions which belong entirely to them.

Since action research is school-based, it is likely to lead to commitment to new professional behaviors--to change. This is especially important when the focus of change is a curriculum area which is not well understood by those who must teach it, as is the case with listening.

LISTENING PROFILE

CALGARY LISTENING INQUIRY PROJECT
Douglas Harkness Community School

Student _____

(Check where appropriate)

DURING A LISTENING/LITERACY SITUATION:	OBSERVATION I Date _____					OBSERVATION II Date _____				
	Most of the time	Quite often	Not very often	Seldom	Can't tell	Most of the time	Quite often	Not very often	Seldom	Can't tell
NON-VERBAL RESPONSES										
Attempts to establish and maintain eye contact with the speaker/reader										
Indicates interest by body position (eg. leans forward, sits comfortably, faces speaker, etc.)										
Provides non-verbal responses where appropriate (eg. smiles, nods, grimaces, raises eyebrows, gestures, etc.)										
Provides vocal responses where appropriate (eg. comments, chuckles, groans, etc.)										
Avoids becoming overly restless and fidgety (eg. shifts body weight, changes leg position, etc.)										
VERBAL RESPONSES										
Provides relevant comments about the speaker's/writer's ideas										
Picks up on the speaker's/writer's ideas and expands on them										
Asks relevant questions about the content of the material										
Shares personal experiences relevant to the content of the material										
Where appropriate, recognizes and comments on inaccuracies in a piece of talk/writing										
BEHAVIORS										
When the situation requires the performance of a task, demonstrates on-task behavior										
When instructions are provided orally, responds to these within a reasonable period of time										

REFERENCES

Burley-Allen, M. (1982). Listening: The Forgotten Skill. New York: John Wiley.

Cosgrove, S. (1981). Using Action Research in the Classroom and School: A Teacher's View. Adelaide, Australia: Australian Association for Research in Education.

Devine, T. (1982). Listening Skills Schoolwide: Activities and Programs. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Dunne, J. (1982). Perceptions of the Frequency of Implementation of Concepts and Skills in a Junior High School Language Arts Curriculum. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Calgary.

Hammill, D., Brown, V., Larsen, S., and Wiederholt, J. (1980). Tests of Adolescent Language: A Multidimensional Approach to Assessment. Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed.

Hanley, G. (1956). Factorial analysis of speech perception. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 21, March.

Hopkins, D. (1985). A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research. Philadelphia: Milton Keynes.

Hoskisson, K., and Tompkins, G. (1987). Language Arts: Content and Teaching Strategies. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing.

Lewin, K. (1948). Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper.

Pearson, D., and Fielding, L. (1982). Research update: listening comprehension. Language Arts, 59, September.

Plattor, E., Unruh, W., Muir, L., and Loose, K. (1978). Alberta Listening Tests. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.

Rankin, P. (1926). The measurement of ability to understand language. Dissertation Abstracts International, 12.

Shuman, R. (1977). Questions English Teachers Ask. Rochelle Park, New Jersey: Hayden Book Company.

Smulyan, L. (1984). Collaborative Action Research: Historical Trends. Unpublished paper, Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association.

Spearritt, D. (1962). Listening Comprehension--A Factorial Analysis. Melbourne, Australia: G. W. Green.

Swanson, C. (1986). Teachers as Listeners: An Exploration. Unpublished paper, Annual Meeting, International Listening Association.

Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., and Griffin, G. (1979). Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Study: Final Report. San Francisco, California: Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Torrance, E. P., Khatena, J., and Cunningham, B. (1973). Thinking Creatively With Sounds and Words. Lexington, Massachusetts: Ginn.

Wilkinson, A., Stratta, L., and Dudley, P. (1980). Listening Comprehension Tests. Canadian Version. Edmonton, Alberta: Edmonton Public School Board.

Wolff, F., Marsnik, N., Tacey, W., and Nichols, R. (1983). Perceptive Listening. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wolvin, A. and Coakley, C. (1985). Listening. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.